DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 366 UD 026 790

TITLE	Work and Family Responsibilities: Achieving a Balance. A Program Paper of the Ford Foundation.
INSTITUTION	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-916584-35-6
PUB DATE	Mar 89
NOTE	46p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ford Foundation, Office of Communications, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Day Care; *Dual Career Family; *Employed Women; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment; Employment Opportunities; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; Flexible Working Hours; *Fringe Benefits; *Mothers; Nontraditional Occupations; Public Policy; *Sex Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Family Responsibility; Parental Leave

ABSTRACT

The relationship between work and family is an issue of growing concern in the United States. The increasing participation of women in the labor force has created new demands for services, especially for low-income families, to offset women's dual responsibilities at work and home. This paper describes a Ford Foundation program to study the place of the workplace in American family life, with the following aims: (1) to broaden the knowledge base on men's and women's roles and their relation to work; (2) to provide models of employer benefit policies and work arrangements; (3) to monitor federal and state policies requiring family benefits; and (4) to promote discussion and exchange on work and family issues. The paper provides an overview of shifts in employment patterns and examines the changing roles of men and women in the workplace. The following family-responsive programs are described: (1) medical leave, including pregnancy disability; (2) family leave, including parental leave; (3) child care; (4) elder care; (5) alternative work schedules; and (6) flexible benefit programs. The paper concludes with a detailed discussion of the four-pronged approach of the Ford Foundation program. A list of 18 references is included. An appendix lists Ford Foundation grants to study work and family issues for 1987-88. (AF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

WORK AND FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES: ACHIEVING A BALANCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carolee E. Iltis
Ford Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A PROGRAM PAPER OF THE FORD FOUNDATION

WORK AND FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES: ACHIEVING A BALANCE

A PROGRAM PAPER OF
THE FORD FOUNDATION

FORD FOUNDATION
NEW YORK, N.Y.

Other papers on Ford Foundation programs:

Too Little, Too Late: Services for Teenage Parents
Child Survival / Fair Start
Not Working: Unskilled Youth and Displaced Adults
Refugees and Migrants: Problems and Program Responses
Civil Rights, Social Justice, and Black America
Hispanics: Challenges and Opportunities (English and Spanish)
Women, Children, and Poverty in America
The Ford Foundation's Work in Population
Ford Foundation Support for the Arts in the United States
Early Childhood Services: A National Challenge

Additional copies of this report, as well as a list of other Foundation publications, may be obtained from the Ford Foundation, Office of Communications, 320 East 43 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
Ford Foundation.
Work and family responsibilities.
(A Program paper of the Ford Foundation)
Bibliography: p.
1. Work and family. 2. Cafeteria benefit plans. 3. Family policy.
I. Title.
HD4904.25.F67 1989 306.8'7 89-1636
ISBN 0-916584-35-6

470 March 1989
© 1989 Ford Foundation

CONTENTS

Preface	v
The Background	1
Employment Shifts	10
Changing Roles of Men and Women	13
Family-Responsive Programs	18
The Ford Foundation's Program	28
Notes	33
Appendix: Ford Foundation Grants—Work and Family Issues	35

PREFACE

One of the most striking characteristics of late twentieth-century America is the dramatic increase in the number of mothers working outside the home, particularly those with young children. The United States now has some nine million children under age six whose mothers are in the labor force. Projections show that women will constitute a growing proportion of the work force, reaching fifty percent before the end of the century. The increasing labor-force participation of mothers with young children as well as accumulating evidence of the benefits of early childhood education and care for preschool children have stimulated a widespread demand for services, particularly for low-income families. Whether families have one or two wage earners, and even when some form of child care is available, the parents often experience difficulties in trying to meet their dual obligations at work and home. Because there has been little diminution of women's traditional housekeeping and care-giving responsibilities, this balancing act is particularly difficult for women. Moreover, since people are living longer, many families are caring for elderly relatives as well as children.

These trends present a great challenge to government policy makers, employers, social service providers, educators, and the families themselves, especially those at the lower end of the income spectrum. To help define and address this challenge, the Ford Foundation is embarking on two related efforts—one directed at creating more choices for families trying to balance work and family responsibilities, and the other addressing the growing need for early childhood services. Two papers describing proposed grant making in these areas were recently presented to the Foundation's Board of Trustees and are now being published as companion volumes: *Work and Family Responsibilities: Achieving a Balance* by June Zeitlin, program officer in the Human Rights and Governance program, and *Early Childhood Services: A National Challenge* by Shelby Miller, program officer in the Urban Poverty program. After discussing the respective chal-

lenges, the papers describe public and private efforts to address them and then outline the Foundation's plans. Over the next few years we hope that these two interrelated programs will help public and private institutions devise more options for women and men trying to meet the multiple demands of work and family life.

Susan V. Berresford
Vice-President
U.S. and International
Affairs Programs
Ford Foundation

THE BACKGROUND

Created Equal, a 1986 report to the Trustees on the Ford Foundation's women's programs, indicated that the Foundation would "explore approaches to what some regard as a 'sticking point' in the women's movement—conflicts caused by the competing demands of work and family." The report noted that:

> In many societies, women have moved into all levels of the work force but usually with little change in their family roles and responsibilities. The lack of change within families produces stress, as women become overworked and as tensions mount between family members over who should do what. These stresses can also result in undesirable reductions in children's care and nurturance. . . . The aim [of this program initiative] will be to increase family-work options for women and men so they can find and provide caring support while pursuing their work and personal lives. The Foundation believes that increasing these options is of fundamental importance to the quality of the society in which we and our children live.

The purpose of this paper is to expand on the nature of the work-family problem and describe the Foundation's response to it.

During the past fifteen years, much of the Foundation's support for programs on behalf of women has focused on expanding employment opportunities, particularly for low-income and minority women, and on advancing and enforcing women's legal rights. Relying on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits employment discrimination, and Executive Order 11246 prohibiting such discrimination by federal contractors, women have achieved important legal victories. For example, women have gained access to a wider range of occupations, including such nontraditional jobs as construction and coal mining; voluntary affirmative action plans to remedy sex discrimination have been upheld; and sexual harassment on the job has been declared illegal. At the same time, however, the wage gap between women and men persists, occupations continue to be segregated by gender, and the growing feminization of poverty has led to a substantial increase in the numbers of poor women and children. Therefore, it is critical to continue to focus on eliminating employ-

ment discrimination, including persistent occupational segregation and pay inequities.

Major gains have been achieved as a result of equal employment opportunity laws, but they do not, by themselves, address the work and family dilemma. Building on the gains toward equality that women have achieved over the past two decades, the next step is to recognize the importance of both wage-earning *and* family responsibilities for women *and* men and to devise affordable policies and programs that support both women and men as they try to balance these dual responsibilities. This is one way to buttress the nation's families, particularly those at the lower end of the income spectrum.

Although most families face common problems in seeking to balance work and family responsibilities, approaches to these problems may vary among different racial or ethnic groups and people of different income levels. For example, some mistakenly assume that the work-family dilemma is of concern only to middle- or high-income families. This may be because the news media and business publications have highlighted this aspect of the issue. Yet it is low-income and minority families, particularly female-headed households, that consistently must shoulder the double burden of work and family and usually without much outside support. In these families, child care is often the deciding factor in whether the mother can continue her education, enter a job-training program, or get a job. The new direction of welfare reform recognizes the importance of child-care services in helping women move from welfare dependency to work. For low-income working mothers, child care and other support services are often critical to their advancement to higher-paying jobs. Expanding the supply of quality child care will benefit all families, but those at the lower end of the income spectrum may require some subsidy to take advantage of it.

Similarly, an unpaid disability or parenting leave would help all families by guaranteeing a job at the end of the leave period. This could be particularly important to lower-income workers who are less able to "bargain" with their employers for such a leave on an individual basis. Yet, such families may not be able to take full advantage of the leave time if it is unpaid. Therefore, in devising policies and programs to accommodate work and family, the special needs of low-income families must be explicitly recognized.

Families continue to be the primary unit of society for rearing children, caring for the elderly, and providing nurturance and support to all of its members. The importance of the family to society was well articulated

by Margaret E. Mahoney, president of the Commonwealth Fund, in a 1986 report. She wrote:

> Someone has said that a family is a haven in which the members can experience success and failure without disgracing themselves. At its best, the family is a sanctuary. Ideally, it mixes independence and dependence. It is rooted in love. It is a unique institution upon which every society has built its core. It is essential to humankind.
>
> The endurance and universality of the concept of family testify to its strength and vitality. Family patterns vary and compositions alter, but the need to belong to something larger than oneself is innate and compelling. This need is demonstrated over and over again by groups that refer to themselves as "family." . . . Children play "family," and elders reinvent it when it does not exist.

Families involve caring for one another, particularly during periods of dependency. This is often thought of as caring for a young child, but it can also mean caring for a parent, spouse, or other adult. Despite all the stresses and strains families have experienced, they continue to play this vital role.

The family, however, is in a state of transition. In the past, many families established a division of labor, with activity in the paid work force being primarily the husband's responsibility and domestic responsibilities resting with the wife. (One notable exception to this pattern has been the long-standing employment of black women outside the home.) Today, only 10 percent of American families fit the traditional model of a two-parent family with children, a wage-earning husband, and a homemaker wife. Even among two-parent families, the proportion where the husband is the only wage earner has dropped to 20 percent; for minority families it is even lower. Women have joined the labor force in unprecedented numbers, particularly those with children under eighteen years of age. These mothers are both married and single, living in two-earner and female-headed households. Their contributions to family income are critical, particularly for families just above the poverty level. The majority of these families juggle the competing demands of work and family through a combination of ingenuity, ad hoc arrangements, and government assistance when available.

At the same time, families are experiencing a high rate of breakup, with one out of every two new marriages ending in divorce and the number of single female-headed households growing from 11.5 percent of all families with children in 1970 to 23 percent in 1986. Sixty percent of the children born in 1984 will spend at least part of their childhood in a one-parent home, and for black children the figure is even higher. Public attention

has focused primarily on the growth of single-parent households and the need to gain the active involvement of the absent parent in child support, if not childrearing. At the same time, other types of families, such as the step-family, have been quietly forming. In these families, the children often have two sets of parents, involving different stresses and adjustments.

The competing demands on family members are obvious. For women in both single-parent and two-earner households, the double responsibility of being a wage earner and homemaker-caretaker can be overwhelming. For lower-income families, particularly those with earnings just above the eligibility level for government benefits, few affordable supports are available. Even for families with financial resources, accommodating these dual roles is often difficult. Men, most of whom view their primary family role as breadwinner, often reduce involvement with their families beyond what they would like in order to meet the demands of the workplace and their families' income requirements. For children, parents' work means not only that they have less time with parents, but also that their parents are under stress from trying to do too much. Many studies have found that 30 percent to 40 percent of employed parents, both women and men, experience conflict, guilt, and stress about their dual roles.

A recent survey, designed for *Fortune* magazine by the Bank Street College of Education Work and Family Life Studies,[2] explored the ways working parents handled the pressures of raising children and doing their jobs. Close to 40 percent of fathers and mothers surveyed reported that their jobs interfered with family life. Over 25 percent of both men and women said that they had tried to cope with this stress by declining a new job, promotion, or transfer because it would have meant less family time. Even so, the evidence indicates that the overwhelming majority of men and women think working parents provide their children with positive role models. Few would (or could) cease working, but most would appreciate some assistance in coping with their dual roles.

Major institutions are also affected. Employers, concerned about worker productivity, are raising questions about the effects of employees' juggling makeshift child-care arrangements or care for elderly parents. Moreover, companies in certain fields that have growing numbers of female employees at lower- and middle-management levels now note the problem of losing valued female workers when the pressures of childrearing conflict with full-time work. There is also tension in schools where teachers, predominantly women, have selected a career with comparatively low prestige and pay in exchange for a more flexible work schedule. Yet, working parents are now seeking more access to teachers in the eve-

ings and more after-school activities for children, which means longer days for teachers.

The forces at work in these matters are decades old, complex, and multiple. The distinguished labor economist Eli Ginsberg predicted several decades ago that future historians would note the entry of large numbers of women into the paid work force as one of the most critical and complex phenomena of the twentieth century in industrialized countries. We should not, therefore, presume we can predict the course that societies will follow. Nor can we presume that social policies to address work-family tensions will be or could be crafted and endorsed quickly, or that any one sector, such as employers, should bear a particular share of the burden as society makes adjustments.

What we can say with certainty is that our current arrangements do not seem right. Too often they do not provide the support and attention that young or elderly family members need. Nor do they seem to give men and women, both of whom are in the work force to stay, many choices about how to fulfill their work responsibilities. And there appears to be a lack of attention to families as a key stabilizing element in our communities.

Since these problems touch on economic realities, traditions, and institutional structures, to name just a few aspects, solutions will come slowly. What the Foundation can do is, first, recognize the problems of work and family as important, affecting the very core of the social system we live in. Second, given the centrality of both work and family in our society, the Foundation can devote a portion of its funds to examining these matters in an effort to contribute to critical thinking about the issues as they develop. The Foundation's program would rest on the assumption that society wants men and women to be able to make commitments to both family and work responsibilities. We sense that women and men may need more choices than they have today and that expanding available options might contribute to steadier performance at work and to stabler and stronger families. The balance each person seeks between these sometimes competing responsibilities will continue to differ; there are few absolutely right or wrong ways to achieve such a balance.

Although there is a substantial body of research and experience about improving job opportunities and working conditions, and about family dynamics and support services, the convergence of the work and family spheres was given little attention until very recently. Now, however, in several countries, policy makers and employers are publicly recognizing not only the opportunities but also the conflicts that women and men face as they struggle to balance their work and family responsibilities. It is, there-

fore, an appropriate time to consider affordable policies and programs that are supportive of families.

Many of the issues underlying the current work-family challenge are not new. The push for a more systematic response to them can be traced to the growing numbers of affected families in the workplace, which now cut across all income, racial, and ethnic categories, and to a new interest in these issues by some employers and fathers. As women become a larger proportion of the work force (in the 1990s women are expected to account for two-thirds of the increase in the size of the labor force), companies that are expanding—for example, high-technology firms—will be competing to attract these workers. Employers who address work and family issues may be better able to compete for new workers and also to retain women who have risen within the ranks to become managers. Second, although the major pressure for attention to work and family matters has come from women, some men also seek a more active role in their families' lives. Yet, as long as less value is placed on men's participation in daily family life, cultural barriers will make it very difficult for men to alter the current imbalance in their approach to work and family.

The Foundation is not alone in being interested in these issues; several of the nation's largest companies have taken steps to address them. IBM, for example, established a child-care resource and referral service in 1984 for all of its employees around the country. By 1986, of the 240,000 employees covered, 14,000 had used the services. IBM recently announced that it would also establish the first nationwide consultation and referral service to assist its employees, retirees, and their families in arranging care for elderly relations. Merck and Company has set up a work and family program that involves sensitizing supervisors to the family responsibilities of employees. American Express instituted a family-leave policy in 1987 that provides parents of newborn or newly adopted children or those with seriously ill family members an unpaid, job-guaranteed, twelve-week leave with benefits and seniority continued. Many hospitals, in response to the nursing shortage, have established on-site child-care centers.

At the same time, larger companies threatened by international competition are re-examining all areas of their businesses, including employee benefits, in their efforts to improve "the bottom line." To meet the competition, according to a *New York Times* article,[2] "only market leadership, strong profits and high stock prices can be allowed to matter." Yet even in smaller companies, as Robert Tomasko pointed out in *Management*, the publication of the American Management Association,[3] "more attention, not less, must be given to providing job security for employees of down-

sized organizations." The configuration of employee benefits is one way to demonstrate this concern.

The government itself may also assume a greater role. As public policies are considered by state and federal governmental agencies, it will be important to keep attention focused on the needs of welfare-dependent and working-poor families. Because several of the policy responses that are gaining wide support lack a funding component, they appear to bring greater benefit to more advantaged families. Since the debate about child care and child development, pregnancy and parenting leaves, and education and prenatal care will be framed around the larger population, the Foundation will want to support analyses of these broadly conceived initiatives and highlight their effects on meeting the needs of the disadvantaged.

These work and family issues are at a crossroads. Neither employers, schools, nor leaders of other community institutions have taken full account of the implications of the fundamental change taking place in American family life. The service sector has responded by instituting twenty-four-hour supermarkets, fast-food establishments, and Sunday shopping. To meet their own needs, a number of employers are beginning to adopt modest family-responsive programs. Pressures may grow, however, for employers, either voluntarily, through the adoption of more formal company policies, or through government programs, to provide new supports for women and men as they adjust to their changing work and family roles and responsibilities. Alternatively, the debate and public interest may falter and the resolution of the work and family challenge will continue to be left to individual families, principally to women.

As society plans for the work force and the workplace of tomorrow, we must find affordable and equitable ways to accommodate family members' dual responsibilities of work and care giving. For some this might mean a shorter work week, or temporary and structured career breaks, or perhaps more work that can be done at home. Certainly, the development of new technology will influence all of these alternatives. Similarly, both the length of the school year and the length of the school day are issues that need to be re-examined in light of the changing nature of work and family responsibilities. For example, the city of Los Angeles has been considering staggering the months children go to school to ease overcrowding. Although the pros and cons of this proposal have been widely debated, no one appears to have considered the consequences for working parents of a two-month break during non-summer months.

Attention may also be refocused on the basic question of the meaning of work in American culture. As women and men spend most of their adult

life in the paid labor force, working primarily for economic reasons, but for personal fulfillment as well, many new questions will arise for which there will be no easy answers. Some are already beginning to surface. They include: How are the family care-giving responsibilities traditionally performed by women at home now being carried out? What will be the effect of these new arrangements, not only on the women and men trying to juggle these responsibilities, but also on the next generation of children? We must consider whether adequate social supports exist for the out-of-home care of children and the elderly that is necessitated by the amount of time women now spend at work, particularly for low-income families. Should incentives be created to shift the overwhelming emphasis placed on work outside the home to one that places greater value on care giving not only by women but also by men? Without returning to the old division of labor between women and men, we must think creatively about new approaches that will enable both women and men to combine work and family life differently. In designing these approaches, we must recognize that the price society is willing to pay is not unlimited.

Unquestionably, the work-family topic is complicated and could take the Foundation in many different directions. As suggested above, a program could include the role of the workplace; the role of the schools in transmitting values and role models about work and family responsibilities; the role of the media, particularly television, in shaping fundamental public attitudes about family life; and further examination of family dynamics. After reviewing the myriad possibilities, the Foundation has decided to focus on the employment sphere at this time. There are several reasons for this choice. First, work is a fundamental component of adults' daily lives; it shapes us and occupies many of our waking hours, which indicates the value society and we, as individuals, place on our work. Second, the workplace is amenable to change and, indeed, has responded over time to other shifts in the labor force. Sometimes this change occurs as a result of internal decision making, as is happening in some sectors with work-family programs, sometimes as a result of collective bargaining, and other times because of a public policy mandate. Third, in some sectors momentum for addressing at least some of these concerns at the workplace is building. There is a growing recognition among government and some private employers that adaptations are needed, and some experimentation is already under way. Indeed, the leadership demonstrated by some employers suggests that change is possible and may have quicker and more direct payoffs than efforts to restructure education programs or reshape public attitudes, however important these may be. Moreover, a broad constituency for a family agenda seems to be emerging. Finally, this approach

builds directly on Foundation programs directed at advancing women's rights and opportunities since these issues affect all women, ranging from women on welfare to office workers to professionals. By focusing on the workplace, therefore, the Foundation would be in a position to help develop a wider range of options for families, particularly those at the lower end of the income spectrum, to achieve the desired balance between work and family responsibilities.

The Foundation's program will have a four-pronged approach:

- Broadening the knowledge base on the changing roles of men and women and their relation to the workplace.
- Examining and disseminating models of employer experimentation with new benefit policies and work arrangements.
- Monitoring state and federal government policies that require family benefits.
- Promoting discussion and exchange among those concerned with work and family issues.

Before turning to a discussion of these program elements we will more fully analyze several of the trends briefly noted in this section and describe the types of benefits included in family-responsive programs in the workplace.

EMPLOYMENT SHIFTS

Today more than half of all women work outside the home. (As a result, the historical gap in the labor-force participation between black women and white women has narrowed substantially.) The most dramatic change has been in the labor-force participation of mothers with children, both in two-earner households and in single female-headed households. In 1940 only 9 percent of mothers with children under eighteen years old were in the labor force. By 1987, 64 percent of all mothers with children were employed, as were 66 percent of black mothers. Although the highest proportion of working mothers was found among those whose youngest child was over six, 62 percent of mothers whose youngest child was three to five years old were employed, as were 53 percent of mothers with children under three years old. The data show that women are in the labor force to stay. In 1988 the Census Bureau reported that for the first time, more than half of new mothers were remaining in the job market. And in future, women are expected to make up an even larger portion of the work force. Women now represent 44 percent, up from 26 percent in 1940, and by the mid-1990s approximately half of the work force will be female.

As a result of the growing labor-force participation by married women and an increase in the number of families maintained by women, men are no longer the sole support of most of the nation's families. Of married working women, 25 percent have husbands who earn less than $10,000 a year, 50 percent have husbands who earn less than $20,000, and 80 percent are married to men who earn less than $30,000. Today, more than 40 percent of the work force are spouses in working-couple households. As wages stagnated, second earners were needed simply to maintain the family's standard of living.

There is no question that the incomes of women are critical to their families. The importance of multiple earners in keeping families out of poverty has been well documented. As Frank Levy points out in *Dollars and Dreams: The Changing American Income Distribution*,[4] women's earnings have made a relatively higher contribution to family income in lower-income families. The average working wife contributes 28 percent of her family's annual income; however, among wives who have year-round full-

time jobs, which includes nearly half of all working wives, the average contribution is 40 percent ($285 per week). The median income of married couples in which the wife worked was almost 50 percent higher than for married couples in which the wife was not in the paid labor force. Among minorities, due to the lower wages earned by many minority men, the gain was considerably higher: 98 percent for black families and over 60 percent for Hispanic families.

Families maintained by women are composed primarily of women and dependent children. These families comprise 23 percent of all families with children, but 54 percent of black families and 29 percent of Hispanic families. A woman maintaining a family on her own typically works full time and earns close to the average amount that wives earn ($278 a week). However, since these families generally lack any other wage earner, they are likely to be poor. In 1984 about one in every three families maintained by women was living in poverty, whereas the poverty rate for all other families was one in thirteen.

Although there has been some improvement in women's wages, women still earn only 65 cents for every dollar that men earn. This modest increase from 59 cents has been attributed to women's growth in the professions and, to a lesser degree, their entry into male-dominated crafts and other occupations. However, the majority of women continue to be concentrated in the lower-paying female-dominated clerical and service occupations. The shift in the economy from a manufacturing to a service base points to continued job growth in the lower-paying service sector, which could mean more women and men working, but also more families living in poverty.[5]

The type of work available is also changing. As fewer new full-time permanent jobs are created, there has been substantial growth among marginal workers. In 1986, 19 percent of employed men and women worked part time, up from 14 percent in 1970. The number of persons working for private temporary agencies in 1986, though still under one million, was nearly double the number in 1982. And there are an estimated one million at-home workers. Although these types of positions certainly bring flexibility, it is often gained at the price of lower pay, fewer benefits, and less opportunity for advancement. This can lead to higher levels of poverty and dependency.

In shaping work and family policies for the future, it is necessary to address the fact that most families in the United States will have women as well as men supporting them and that most children now have, and will continue to have, working mothers as well as working fathers. While fami-

lies have adapted in order to earn a living and care for their children, institutions, including those in both the public and the private sector, have not yet responded adequately to the shifts in family patterns. So long as our society expects both mother and father to pursue family and work responsibilities, we must consider institutional support for these dual roles for both men and women.

CHANGING ROLES OF MEN AND WOMEN

Although traditional stereotypes about the roles of men and women are still embedded in our culture, the attitudes expressed by both men and women have evolved in a more egalitarian direction. Prior to 1940 over 80 percent of the population disapproved of married women working outside the home. By 1982, 75 percent of Americans approved of married women in the workplace. Similarly, attitudes toward working mothers have evolved as more mothers have joined the work force. People now think child care is a joint responsibility of mothers and fathers, even though in practice most mothers still have primary responsibility. One signal of this change is the recent growth in diaper-changing areas in men's rest rooms in airports around the country.

Despite this shift in public approval of changing roles for men and women and the dramatic increase in the number of employed women, sharp sex-role distinctions persist. For example, every study on the division of household tasks has found that women continue to perform far more of the chores than men. This holds regardless of whether the wife works outside the home full time, part time, or not at all. The only group of household tasks in which husbands predominated was handyman and yard work. Paying the bills was equally divided between husbands and wives, but wives had principal responsibility for cleaning house, preparing meals, washing dishes, and child care. If today's college students are harbingers of the future, this division of labor will remain. In a survey conducted by the Women's Resource Center at the University of California at Berkeley, two-thirds of the men and half of the women interviewed said the husband's career comes first and most men were unwilling to do laundry or cook dinner.

Given the pervasive societal belief that women are responsible for the home, it is no wonder they experience difficulties in gaining acceptance in the work world from both employers and male co-workers. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, one of the few to examine how the organization and culture of the workplace affect women, reported in *Men and Women of the Corporation*,[5] her landmark book published ten years ago, that business women had been placed in the most peripheral and least visible jobs. At a recent Academy of Management conference, Kanter updated this theme, noting that

while women are making significant inroads in the lower levels of management, they are still underrepresented in positions nearer the top.

In *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Kanter also described the effects on women of companies' demands on managers, who are expected to show that the company is one of their highest priorities by spending an enormous amount of time working. Loyalty and commitment to the company are measured by a willingness to work long hours overtime—at night, on weekends, and on holidays. This pressure for total dedication precludes the full participation of women who have other important demands on their time, which may differ from those of men. In regard to working women with children, Kanter stated:

> Flex-time isn't going to help. We're talking about voluntary overtime, about people who think that anyone who just gets through isn't doing enough. Day care won't help. These people [managers] work at night.

Kanter's view has been reinforced by subsequent research, most recently by the Bank Street College Work and Family Life Studies in an experiment with Merck and Company. One top corporate official acknowledged that, though great value was placed on individual employees, he measured loyalty and performance by how many cars were in the parking lot on Saturday.

Others, including Lotte Bailyn at the Sloan School of Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, have pointed out that traditional organizational assumptions about employees limit the participation of an increasingly diverse work force of men and women who need to develop new patterns of work and family relations.[7] Among the outmoded assumptions are that "family patterns are traditional" and that "employees should be totally work-involved." Bailyn notes that establishing both a career and a family requires major personal commitments and that previously "these two tasks belong[ed] to different people: one person establish[ed] a career and another the family." She recommends consideration of "an alternative career model (the 'slow burn' or apprenticeship model)," which allows for meeting family responsibilities while moving more slowly along a career track. This would contrast sharply with the pattern currently followed by many women of postponing a family until their careers are established and then trying to manage both career and family or dropping the career for a time.

Although there is general agreement that organizations can afford to change, change does not come easily; often it is the result of outside shock or pressure. Changes in the workplace will depend on changes in the corporate culture. Some companies, particularly those with an adequate sup-

ply of labor, are unlikely to change at all. On the other hand, in companies that rely on large numbers of female employees, the increase in the number of working parents may be sufficient to lead employers to make accommodations to women workers and those with family responsibilities. The Conference Board has identified several factors that motivate firms to consider workers' family needs.[8] These include:

- the need to recruit skilled workers in the face of a demand for labor
- the need for a more productive work force in the face of domestic and foreign competition
- the need to reduce absenteeism and lateness by offering stabler child-care arrangements.

Companies like Merck, IBM, Control Data Corporation, and Johnson and Johnson have initiated programs to meet the needs of their workers. These programs should be monitored and assessed.

One approach to modifying the workplace culture, which Merck has adopted, is to sensitize supervisors to work and family issues. The Bank Street College Work and Family Life Studies, which examined job and family demands of parents at Merck, found that supervisors played a key role, particularly for men. The period of time before their children entered school (under six years of age) seemed to be the hardest of all for both employed fathers and mothers. Yet mothers were more likely to have higher stress levels and greater work-family conflicts than fathers. The critical variable for mothers was the quality and stability of child-care arrangements. Although this was also an important factor for fathers, the most critical variable for the men was the degree of sensitivity of their supervisors to work-family needs. When a father assumes responsibility for child care it is still a nontraditional role and he is far more sensitive to his employer's response. The National Council of Jewish Women recently completed a survey of over 2,000 employers and 2,500 pregnant women employees as part of its study "Mothers in the Workplace." The study found that supervisors played a key role in helping employees accommodate their family responsibilities. Until the workplace sets a higher value on the needs of the family, many men and women will feel constrained in taking up a more active family role.

Although interest in work-family matters in the United States is just beginning, Sweden has more than a decade of experience with these matters. In Sweden, both fathers and mothers are eligible for a one-year paid parental leave. Twenty-seven percent of fathers utilize some portion of this leave. Participation rates are even higher in such other parental insurance

22

programs as paid sick days to care for ill children and "daddy days" following childbirth. A recent study of Sweden's parental-leave policy showed that men who take the leave were more likely to have support from friends and particularly their partners, to know other men who had taken leaves, and to have partners whose mothers had worked. Although higher education levels were correlated with increased leave-taking, economic factors appeared to have less of an independent effect. Rather, the study found the most important barrier to greater male use of parental leave was attitude toward gender roles. That is, men and to some degree women who believed a man should be the primary breadwinner and that this was the primary measure of his success were less likely to take parental leave or to encourage their partners to do so. A second factor cited was an unwillingness by employers and supervisors to consider men as active fathers. However, it was also noted that while employers and supervisors were more supportive of women taking parental leave, a majority still were not positive. The study concludes that the traditional exclusion of men from child care is highly resistant to change, requiring not only public policy and employer support, but also a change in ingrained sex-role attitudes.[9]

The Swedish government itself has been grappling with this issue. In 1983 the Working Party for the Role of the Male was established to develop proposals for moving the society toward equality between men and women. As part of its study, the Working Party examined the role of the workplace and identified obstacles to equal opportunity. One of the most fundamental obstacles was the occupational segregation of men and women in different sectors of the labor market, which the study found reinforces the traditional inequality of women. (It should be noted that Sweden has one of the most highly segregated work forces.) The report by the Working Party concludes:

> Equality of opportunity in working life will depend on the presence of roughly the same number of men and women in all sectors of the labor market. This will require men and women to choose different educational paths and occupational categories and presupposes that they are encouraged to do so right at the kindergarten stage and at school. . . . [N]o fundamental change can be brought about in working life unless men are prepared to seek employment in the care sector and other occupations where women predominate.

Understanding the types of questions being asked in Sweden and the solutions pursued there as part of a move toward greater equality can help inform our own work in the United States. Undoubtedly, the approaches and solutions will vary in each country.

Despite the passage of equal opportunity laws, occupational segregation by gender persists in the United States, thereby reinforcing prevailing attitudes and stereotypes. Today, 80 percent of women workers are in occupations in which at least 70 percent of the employees are women. Efforts to challenge this segregation have concentrated on helping women gain access to higher-paying male-dominated jobs, rather than on the less tangible barriers inherent in the pervasively "male" culture of the workplace. In 1985 the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), in a study of occupational segregation,[10] identified three different cultural axioms that have been used to exclude women from the workplace and to restrict them to certain occupations: those related to women's "natural" role in the home; those related to the male-female relationship, with women subordinate; and those related to stereotyped notions of innate differences between the sexes. The NAS report noted that women's supposed manual dexterity and passivity are offered to explain their employment as clerical workers, while construction firms cite women's alleged weakness and intolerance of harsh working conditions as reasons for denying them jobs. Women have often been thought to be "too good" for politics, "too timid" to enforce the law, and "too emotional" for positions in medicine, law, and science. Although the number of women is increasing in nontraditional occupations, particularly in the professions but also in blue-collar jobs, these women face heightened conflicts in meeting the demands of their work while also challenging sex-stereotyped behavior in what continues to be overwhelmingly male environments.

Yet, much of the culture of the workplace as it relates to women, whether it is downgrading family care giving or permitting sexual innuendos, is not peculiar to the workplace. Rather, it is a more general expression of cultural attitudes and norms about the roles of men and women. Changes in societal attitudes toward greater acceptance of women as wage earners and, indeed, the presence of women in new occupations, albeit in small numbers, are having an effect on the work environment. However, to alter the culture of the workplace with respect to gender roles, one must also address more general societal attitudes.

FAMILY-RESPONSIVE PROGRAMS

Any discussion of work and family must eventually turn to benefit policies because they move the discussion from the abstract to the concrete. Moreover, it is through benefits that employees are seeking recognition of their family needs.[1] This section will describe the variety of benefits that are considered possible components of a family-responsive program in the workplace. It will include a discussion of the current state of the law, proposed changes, and employer practices.

In the United States, unlike other industrialized countries, the extent and type of benefits available to most workers are determined by their employers. Social Security (for old age and long-term disability) is the only fully national insurance system. Unemployment insurance provides nationwide coverage, but its level and duration are set by the states. Through tax incentives, the government encourages employers to provide other benefits, such as health insurance and dependent care, but by and large these benefits are left to the individual employer or to collective bargaining. Therefore, efforts to improve the benefits available to working families must focus both on the voluntary efforts of individual employers and on the role of the federal and state governments in setting minimum requirements. (For those who are unable to work, government benefits are available, provided income eligibility and other criteria are met.)

Several companies, interested in responding to work-family needs, have relied on such outside researchers as the Bank Street College of Education and the Boston University School of Social Work to survey their employees before introducing specific family-support programs to try to establish a link between family problems and productivity. According to the Conference Board, "The findings from this research provide evidence of employee absenteeism and tardiness. . . . The data suggest that the bottom line may be affected negatively when companies do not address the family needs of their employees."[2]

Leave Times

There are instances when family circumstances cause a significant and sometimes impossible conflict with work responsibilities. These circumstances can include pregnancy disability or other temporarily disabling

condition, a newborn or newly adopted child, or a parent or child with a serious illness. These instances are temporary in the sense that the condition ends or some other arrangement is made so the worker may return to his or her job. In the United States, the availability of leaves for such reasons is left to the individual employer. The only exception is temporary disability insurance coverage for pregnancy and other medical disabilities, which is required by five states.

Medical Leave, Including Pregnancy Disability

Although many employers allow pregnant employees to use a combination of sick leave and annual leave, the income often runs out before the period of disability ends. Thus, at this crucial time, families often face a loss of the mother's income simultaneous with the birth of a child. Today less than 40 percent of working women are eligible for a paid six- to eight-week leave for pregnancy disability. Such benefits tend to be provided by large corporate employers rather than by small firms with fewer than twenty-five employees, where women comprise 43 percent of the work force.[17] Yet, five states—New York, California, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Hawaii—as well as Puerto Rico, which together cover almost one-quarter of the nation's work force, do require employers to provide temporary disability insurance (TDI) coverage. TDI guarantees partial salary replacement to workers unable to work due to a serious medical condition, including pregnancy disability, for up to twenty-six weeks (thirty-nine weeks in California).[18] These plans are self-financing, by employee contributions only or by shared employer-employee contributions. Since almost all businesses and workers are covered, this approach is particularly important for low-income workers.

Employers outside of these states are not required by law to provide TDI, but those who do offer this benefit are required by a federal law, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA), to include pregnancy disability in their coverage. Adopted in 1978, the PDA explicitly states that discrimination on the basis of pregnancy is in fact sex discrimination and that employers must treat women disabled by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions the same as other temporarily disabled employees.[19] As a result of the PDA, employers that provide health insurance and disability coverage are required to include pregnancy in these policies.

Treating pregnancy disability like other temporary disabilities grew out of both the legal battle to treat pregnancy discrimination as sex discrimination and the fear that treating women workers differently, even if, as in this case, it meant additional benefits, would place women as a class in a disadvantaged position in the job market.[20]

A different approach to pregnancy coverage has been adopted by most of the industrialized world. In 1985 more than 100 countries, ranging from Germany and Japan to many less developed nations, provided a job-protected leave at the time of childbirth, a cash benefit replacing all or part of the lost wages while on leave, and health care or insurance. Paid leave of six months in the European countries is often supplemented by additional unpaid leave for child care. These maternity benefits, as they are called, are available to women only, but many countries are also adopting parental leave, so men, too, can benefit. The European approach unquestionably provides needed income protection to the family, but it is a part of a social insurance system that is far more comprehensive than what is available in the United States.

There is a broad-based effort under way in the United States to adopt federal legislation, the Family and Medical Leave Act, that would require employers of more than fifty people (reduced to thirty-five employees after three years) to provide an unpaid job-protected leave with continued health benefits for up to fifteen weeks for any temporary medical disability, including pregnancy. This approach, which does not single out women for special treatment, would provide important job protections and benefits to all workers and their families. It would be of greater value to low-income families if it also contained a wage-replacement component.

There are several promising and affordable approaches to achieving paid leave for pregnancy disability. The first is encouraging employers to adopt such policies. Although some companies have had these policies in place for twenty years, there have been few efforts, other than one in 1984 by the nonprofit organization Catalyst, to assess the costs and benefits of existing programs or to develop models that other employers could replicate. The second approach is encouraging more states to require temporary disability insurance coverage. The cost of this program has been modest and in some states is borne solely by employees. Even where employers share in the cost, as in New Jersey, it does not appear to be burdensome. Finally, research is needed to identify options in designing a national paid-leave system so that discussions can begin on whether such an approach is feasible or desirable.

Family Leave, Including Parental Leave

Far fewer employers, in the private or public sector, offer a job-protected leave to care for a newly born or adopted child or other family member. In most instances, this type of leave is negotiated by individual employees with their employers. Family leave is often dispensed as a reward to "favored" employees; it is not generally available to workers at

all levels. Parental leave, almost always unpaid, also seems to be more widely available to women than men, and even where it is offered to men, few take advantage of the full leave period. The Catalyst survey of large employers found that half of those who responded provided an unpaid personal or parental leave to employees after childbirth. Another survey, of firms of various sizes, conducted by Sheila Kamerman and Alfred Kahn of Columbia University's School of Social Work, found only very brief paternity leaves for men. Both studies found that, despite the availability of a longer leave period, the vast majority of women took leave for less than three months. The study by the National Council of Jewish Women, which was the first to include smaller companies, found that small companies are just as likely as larger ones to provide some family leave but that it is generally negotiated individually rather than contained in their standard personnel policies.

Five states—Maine, Minnesota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin—enacted legislation requiring employers to provide an unpaid job-guaranteed leave varying from six to thirteen weeks to both men and women on the birth or adoption of a child. Connecticut has enacted a similar leave requirement of up to twenty-four weeks for employees of public agencies. The proposed federal Family and Medical Leave Act would require employers to provide up to ten weeks of unpaid leave after the birth or adoption of a child or to care for a child or parent with a serious medical condition. This would give new parents, women and men, some time to be at home with an infant without having to give up their jobs. We will want to follow the implementation of these new laws closely, particularly with regard to the use of unpaid leave by lower-income families.

Another way to view parental leave is as an important part of a comprehensive child-care policy. Because of the limited availability and expense of quality infant-care arrangements, the option of care in the home is critical for many families during that early period. Even as we try to increase the supply of child care and improve its quality, we should also strive to devise more flexible arrangements that will enable parents themselves to care for their children while continuing to be wage earners. (See below for a more detailed discussion of dependent care.)

A related issue is who takes the leave when it is available. As noted, women take advantage of family leaves more than men. A growing number of men are seeking more active involvement in their families, but often they are discouraged in their place of work from taking leave. Without some type of affirmative effort, it may be difficult or impossible for men to use the benefits available to them.

The Foundation's examination of this question can be informed by the

experience in Sweden, where a systematic program was undertaken to encourage fathers to use available leave time. Sweden adopted a Parent Insurance Law in 1974 allowing both fathers and mothers a paid parental leave. At that time, only 2 percent of fathers took advantage of the leave option; by 1986, 27 percent of Swedish fathers used some portion of their leave time. The Swedish government is attempting to identify other ways to encourage more men to use parental leave.

Dependent Care

This term refers to the care of a dependent, usually a child but often an elderly parent or other relative. Attention has focused on the increasing demand for child care by working parents, but the need for new and different forms of care for the elderly is also growing. Moreover, workers need different kinds of dependent care at different points in their lives and careers so it is important that employee benefits take into account the varying needs workers may have over the long term.

Child Care

The U.S. child-care system is a patchwork of parents' contributions, various types of employer assistance, government subsidies, and, increasingly, the public schools. (For a detailed discussion of child care see the Foundation program paper *Early Childhood Programs: A National Challenge.*)

Although precise statistics are not available, there is general agreement that the supply of affordable, quality child care in no way meets the needs of families today. As a result, many working parents must devise ad hoc child-care arrangements, which, not surprisingly, break down frequently. A recent survey commissioned by *Fortune* showed that parents do lose time from work to attend to family matters, whether it be a sick child or school event. One major finding of the survey was that "problems with child care are the most significant predictors of absenteeism and unproductive time at work."

Availability of child care can also make the critical difference as to whether a woman can go to work at all. A 1982 study by Martin O'Connell and Carolyn C. Rogers[17] found that one-quarter of the mothers at home said they would look for work if child care were available, with the numbers being even higher among single and low-income mothers. The current direction of welfare reform illustrates a growing recognition that child care is a necessary support for women seeking employment.

The Foundation's work and family initiative will focus on two areas,

both in collaboration with the Foundation's Urban Poverty program. The first will deal with the role of the employer in expanding the supply of child care and in providing workers with a subsidy to help meet the cost of their children's care. The second will focus on public policy to ensure that the perspective of working women, especially low-income women, is articulated in the public debate.

Employer-Sponsored Child-Care Assistance. In 1978 approximately 110 companies had some type of child-care program; by 1986 that number had climbed to over 3,000. This is a dramatic increase, but it still represents only a fraction of the six million companies in the United States.

Corporate support for child care takes many different forms, including on-site care and subsidies for care off the premises either by reimbursing the employee or paying program costs directly. (In 1985 there were only 150 corporate work-site child-care centers and 400 centers in hospitals.) Employers also provide salary-reduction plans, which allow employees to set aside pre-tax dollars in Flexible Spending Accounts to be used for child-care expenses, or they sponsor Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAP), in which employers pay for child care with tax-deductible dollars by reimbursing the employee or by paying the child-care provider directly. The fastest growing corporate initiative is child-care resource and referral (R&R) programs; 500 companies provided this service in 1985. These programs help parents locate and choose child care and often provide resources and technical assistance to increase the number of child-care programs and improve their quality.

Employers are increasingly recognizing the link between stable child-care arrangements and employee productivity. Most research to date on the effectiveness of work-family programs has evaluated company-sponsored child-care programs, particularly in hospitals. Although they do not point directly to improved productivity, three national studies found that management believed that establishing on-site child care enhanced recruitment efforts, employee morale, and the company's public image in the community; two of the studies found that it also reduced turnover and absenteeism.[18]

As employer-sponsored programs spread, it will be important to document their costs and benefits and to disseminate information about the best models and results to other employers and employee groups, including labor unions. Employers and labor unions could also add an important perspective to the policy debate about child care and help shape an affordable public policy initiative that would fill current gaps in service.

Public Policy Initiatives. Although all families share a need for expanded child-care services, low-income families often cannot afford

child care unless a subsidy is provided by the employer or the government. In 1988 more than 100 national organizations, including children's and women's groups, unions, social service organizations, and religious groups, formed the Alliance for Better Child Care. Its goal is to develop a plan that would make affordable, high-quality child care more readily available to working parents. Proposed federal legislation sought by the group would provide additional funds to states for child-care assistance to low- and moderate-income working families. It would also help states increase the number of child-care facilities and qualified providers.

The needs of working women with young children, especially low-income women, must be part of the public debate on expanded child care. Those representing the interests of parents may look at the issues somewhat differently from those who advocate on behalf of children. This is not to suggest that the child should not be the primary focus, but that the voices of parents should be heard in the debate. For example, how can we balance the need for quantity with assuring high quality? How can we balance quality with affordability? These are not easy questions to answer and it is important that many groups, including those representing women and particularly minority women, participate in discussions about them.

Elder Care

The amount of time workers spend caring for older parents is just now emerging as a workplace issue. This may be attributed, first, to the growing proportion of the elderly who are seventy-five years or older, and second, to the diminishing ability of family members, many of whom are now employed, to provide all aspects of the needed care. Currently about 80 percent of the care received by the elderly is provided by family members—usually a spouse, a daughter, or a daughter-in-law.

A survey by Travelers Companies, a large insurance firm, found that approximately one out of every five employees over age thirty provides some care to an elderly parent, most often a widowed mother. These employees spend about ten hours per week providing care, with 8 percent spending thirty-five hours or more each week. The majority of these care givers are women, even when it is the husband's parent who needs care. Women workers are often caught between the generations, first arranging for the care of their children and then responsible for the care of their own or their spouse's parents.

Although research in this area is limited, studies have found that employees with elder-care responsibilities, like employees with child-care responsibilities, experience high stress levels and a high incidence of absenteeism and lateness. Several federally funded studies are under way

to learn more about the effects on work performance of employees' responsibilities for elderly relatives and to experiment with different corporate responses.

Alternative Work Schedules

Another frequent source of tension resulting from competing work and family demands is the lack of flexibility in most jobs in terms of work hours. Alternative work schedules such as flex-time have been widespread for the last ten years. Today, almost 12 percent of all full-time workers are on flex-time. Its impact has generally been positive for the worker in allowing some flexibility in the work day and for the employer in terms of reducing tardiness and absences. For working mothers, however, studies report mixed results. The added flexibility is important for handling day-to-day family responsibilities, but the modest time changes do not, of themselves, address some of the more basic family issues such as leave time or adequate child care.

The aspect of work scheduling that has recently experienced unprecedented growth is the use of part-time and temporary workers. Some see this growth as a positive trend that responds to women's desires both to continue in the labor market and to raise a family. Most, however, view it as a result of management's looking for greater flexibility in staffing and fewer obligations to workers. In general, part-time workers earn less per hour and are less likely to have health insurance or pension plans than those working full time. Moreover, there are fewer opportunities for training, career advancement, or a return to full-time employment. As a result, there is growing discussion of extending to part-time workers both wage protections and such benefits as health insurance and pensions at least on a prorated basis.

Although most part-time workers (70 percent) choose to work reduced hours, a significant portion (30 percent) would prefer to be employed full time. Women make up the majority of both voluntary and involuntary part-time workers, but among the voluntary group almost 60 percent are married women living with their husbands. The majority of the involuntary part-time work force, on the other hand, are single, widowed, divorced, or separated women who tend to have lower median family incomes and a higher incidence of poverty than other part-time workers.

Unquestionably, however, part-time work is one way to balance work and family responsibilities, particularly for families with fewer financial concerns. Yet for those seeking to accommodate work and family, most of whom are women, there are few available alternatives to part-time work.

In fact, the National Council of Jewish Women's study found that one of the most important things missing in the workplace was a transition period during which women could return to their jobs after the birth of a child, but on a part-time basis.

Flexible Benefit Programs

With the increased number of women in the work force and the growth of dual-earner families, the types of benefits employees seek for their families have changed considerably. Moreover, workers with small children may have different needs than workers looking toward retirement. A range of benefits is needed to reflect a more diverse work force.

A new approach, first introduced to reduce the high cost of employee health insurance and now proving popular with employees, is the flexible, or cafeteria, benefit package, in which an employee can select a menu of choices that best fit his or her needs. Currently, there are about 150 comprehensive cafeteria benefit plans, and many more companies are likely to adopt this approach in the future. The advantage of these programs is that they allow workers to pick and choose benefits to meet the changing needs of their families. And dual-earner families can expand their coverage if each partner selects different options.

Since companies are just beginning to offer these flexible plans, little evidence is available as to their effectiveness either in reducing costs or in providing benefits better targeted to each employee's needs. There is some concern that employees will give up long-term security in favor of more immediate benefits. Some advocate a core group of benefits with flexibility offered only for additional coverage. Research is needed to assess how well these plans meet the objectives of both employers and employees.

One of the most critical benefit issues is that of employer-provided family health coverage. For low-income female-headed households, health benefits, like child care, are a key to achieving economic self-sufficiency. Yet it is precisely low-wage jobs, where many of these women are employed, that do not offer the needed coverage. Although 97 percent of all workers have individual health insurance, with close to three-quarters of that insurance paid for by employers, less than half of American households have family health coverage paid for by the employer. Moreover, less than two-thirds of all employed female household heads participated in an employer-related group health plan. This is due in large measure to their concentration in service work, where fewer benefits are available.

Recently the federal government has taken a more active role in expanding the minimum health benefit employers must provide. In 1985

the law was expanded to require all employers of twenty or more who provide group health insurance coverage to continue family benefits following the termination, divorce, or death of the covered worker. Widows, divorced spouses, and children can continue to receive coverage for up to five years. This should help close at least part of the gap low-wage women workers face in gaining health coverage for themselves and their families. Federal legislation has also been introduced to require all employers to offer family health insurance and to require that this coverage be extended to part-time workers. The states, too, are beginning to experiment with innovative approaches to health benefits. Massachusetts, for example, recently became the first state to guarantee health insurance to all residents, whether employed or unemployed. (Although employers are not required to offer health insurance benefits, the law offers incentives for those that do.) This development could prove extremely important for low-income working families.

THE FORD FOUNDATION'S PROGRAM

As the foregoing discussion suggests, accommodating the competing demands of work and family may bring changes in public attitudes and institutional arrangements, as well as new laws and public policies. As these developments proceed, the Foundation will want to pay special attention to the special needs of lower-income families. In the past, direct subsidies or programs targeted to the lowest income level, such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, have not had a sufficiently broad constituency to be sustained adequately. On the other hand, programs that benefit a broader constituency, such as Social Security, are very expensive. In addressing work and family issues, these different approaches will have to be considered. In any case, as solutions are proposed that are not explicitly targeted to low-income families, the Foundation will want to look carefully at how such families can benefit from uniform benefits for all workers.

As noted earlier, the Foundation will pursue a four-pronged approach:

- Broadening the knowledge base on the changing roles of men and women and their relation to the workplace.
- Examining and disseminating models of employer experimentation with new benefit policies and work arrangements.
- Monitoring state and federal government policies that require family benefits.
- Promoting discussion and exchange among those concerned with work and family issues.

Broadening the Knowledge Base

This strategy will begin to map out the fundamental questions raised by changing gender roles and responsibilities at home and at work. Our aim is to develop a framework for future research and discussion.

Although considerable research exists on the culture of the workplace and on possible future organizational models, there is need for a greater

focus on gender roles and changing family responsibilities. For example, the Foundation might provide support for a study of how the workplace culture reinforces traditional gender roles, and the extent to which that affects not only women's success but also the division of family responsibilities. These issues need to be examined in a variety of contexts, including blue-collar occupations, low-wage service-sector jobs where women predominate, the corporate hierarchy, and the professions.

One of the principal longer-term questions relates to the shifting of men's roles. For men who want a greater care-giving role, approaches must be developed to overcome the influences of the workplace and society that devalue such a role. The Foundation's work in this area would be designed to increase recognition of the fact that both women and men face work-family conflicts and that each may need help in making accommodations. We might investigate, for example, what steps employers have undertaken to alter the culture of the workplace and to establish mechanisms to ensure that men as well as women have the opportunity to use family benefits. This investigation might also include a review of the experiences of Scandinavian and other European countries, particularly their experiments with such family-responsive programs as parental leave, and their efforts to encourage male as well as female employees to use these programs.

Another important area to explore is alternative work arrangements in the United States and other countries. For example, one might examine the results of experiments with different career paths for people with family responsibilities or structured career breaks that would accommodate a substantial absence from the labor force. The United Kingdom is trying such experiments in banking and insurance. Other avenues to explore might include technological advances that make it easier to work at home, a shorter work week, or the option of a longer and more flexible transition period of part-time work before returning to full-time employment.

We might also try to stimulate research on the consequences of the emphasis on the primacy of work in our society for women as well as men. This could involve a discussion of alternative societal visions, consistent with women's progress toward equality, which place a higher value on care giving. And, we might want to look beyond the workplace and explore where and how public attitudes are formed, for example, school, family, and television, and whether they reflect the changing roles and responsibilities of women and men. Further refinement of this agenda is planned by bringing together people from different fields, including scholars from several disciplines, employers, and employee representatives, to advise the Foundation.

Model Employer Programs

This is designed to assist the many employers, in both the private and public sectors, who are interested in developing family-responsive programs, by building on the experiences of companies that already have such programs. To evaluate the costs and effectiveness of existing programs, and to disseminate this information among employers, the Foundation has provided support to the Bank Street College of Education Work and Family Life Studies. It is developing a series of reports containing "how to" information along with descriptions of model programs and their documented costs and benefits. The series will start with an overall guide to work and family programs, including parental leave, dependent-care assistance, work-scheduling arrangements, and flexible benefit plans. This first report will be followed by more detailed guides to particular programs, beginning with leave times. The reports will be widely disseminated to employers through the Conference Board and other organizations. In addition, Bank Street will undertake the first survey of family-responsive programs for state employees in the fifty states. It is anticipated that the results will be used to stimulate programs for public employees and build public support for work and family programs.

Additional areas of research that might be supported include the effect supervisors have on the use of family benefits by employees; the adoption of family-responsive programs among employers of varying sizes, paying particular attention to the cost concerns of smaller businesses; and the effectiveness of flexible benefit plans in addressing employees' needs while containing employers' cost.

There is growing recognition that employers have an important, although certainly not exclusive, role to play in developing an expanded supply of affordable child care. It is anticipated that the Bank Street reports discussed above will include models of employer child-care assistance and documentation of their costs and benefits to employers and employees.

State and Federal Government Policies

This portion of the program would include research to develop and evaluate policy options, including their costs, as well as public education, technical assistance, and legal advocacy to enforce existing laws. It would also support efforts to develop innovative state and national work and family measures for all families, but particularly for low-income families.

The research documenting employer-sponsored work and family programs in both the public and private sectors discussed above would help to

inform the public debate on these issues. In addition, the National Academy of Sciences, with partial funding from the Foundation, has created a Panel on Employer Policies and Working Parents. The panel will undertake a cross-disciplinary review, evaluation, and synthesis of existing research on the costs and effectiveness of employer and government policies in meeting families' needs; it will also set out a research agenda and policy options for the future.

The Foundation will continue to support policy-focused research to evaluate the effectiveness of existing state laws, such as the temporary disability insurance program, which provides paid leave for pregnancy disability, and recently adopted unpaid job-protected parental leaves, in terms of both their costs to employers and benefits to employees, particularly for lower-income workers. A grant was recently made to the Bank Street College Work and Family Life Studies for a comparative evaluation of the newly adopted parental-leave laws in Oregon, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. It is anticipated that this study will provide solid information about the utilization, costs, and effectiveness of these programs, which will be useful not only for these states but also for others considering similar policies.

Research would also be supported to develop innovative policy options for a paid family and medical leave program. Although there has been considerable debate about requiring employers to provide unpaid family and medical leave, discussion of how best to provide and pay for a paid leave has barely begun. Substantial research has been done on the laws and policies adopted by other countries, but there has been no work undertaken on how the United States, in the context of its own social insurance systems, might provide paid leave if it chooses to do so. This research would examine the benefit policies of both government and private employers. The aim would be to lay the intellectual groundwork for future public policy discussions.

Another area to be examined is the growth in part-time and temporary work, particularly their effects on women and families in terms of income, benefits, and opportunities for advancement, with special attention to workers at the lower end of the income spectrum. New Ways to Work, an organization that encourages experimentation with various work-time options by private- and public-sector employers, has received support to develop voluntary models of equitable flexibility.

The second component of this approach would be monitoring federal and state policies on income and family supports, family and medical leave, dependent care, and part-time work and related benefits. This part of the program would also support public education, technical assistance,

and advocacy, including litigation. As the debate about work and family is advanced at the state and federal levels, participants should include leaders of organizations that have a strong record on equal employment and sex equity issues and a commitment to advocacy on behalf of low-income families dependent on the government to meet their needs. Currently, the Women's Legal Defense Fund has received support to monitor the enforcement of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and to continue its advocacy on family and medical leave and other work and family policies. The National Women's Law Center has received support to expand its work on child care issues and to continue its work on income- and family-support programs, welfare reform, and more equitable tax policies for low-income women and their families. The Center for Law and Social Policy has received support for its work on public benefits for low-income families.

Discussion and Exchange

Many of the issues that emerge in an examination of work and family, such as parental leave or child care, are not new, and must have been on the agendas of women's or children's organizations for many years. Yet no single group has been able to develop a sufficiently broad constituency to achieve systemic changes in these areas. The work and family framework provides an opportunity to bring together not only women's and children's organizations but also labor unions, employer organizations, and organizations of the elderly for a discussion of a common "family" agenda.

We will work closely with the Foundation's Urban Poverty program to foster more outreach and collaboration between women's and children's advocacy organizations. We will seek opportunities to find consensus with employers on work and family issues, through the Conference Board or public-sector associations. In addition, we will pursue activities that help build coalitions with unions and organizations like the Coalition of Labor Union Women, which have already taken steps to add work and family issues to their agendas. Support has already been given to the Child Care Action Campaign, which includes representatives from diverse groups, for a conference on "Child Care: The Bottom Line." The Foundation also made a planning grant to the Institute for American Values, a new organization that is working to bring diverse groups together around policies that are supportive of families. And the Foundation has supported a similar effort being undertaken at the state level by Citizens Fund, an educational organization working with low- and moderate-income people at the local, state, and national levels.

NOTES

1. "Executive Guilt: Who's Taking Care of the Children?" *Fortune*, February 16, 1987.
2. "Remaking the American C.E.O." *New York Times*, January 25, 1987.
3. "Running Lean, Staying Lean." *Management*, November 1987.
4. Frank Levy, *Dollars and Dreams: The Changing American Income Distribution*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1987.
5. The more generic economic issues of a shift in the economy from manufacturing to service jobs and the increase in low-wage jobs are addressed elsewhere in the Foundation by both the Governance and Public Policy and Urban Poverty programs.
6. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books (paperback), 1979.
7. "Issues of Work and Family in Organizations: Responding to Social Diversity," in *Working with Careers*, Michael Arthur et al., eds. Center for Research in Career Development, Columbia University Graduate School of Business, 1984.
8. Diana E. Friedman, *Family Supportive Policies: The Corporate Decision-Making Process*. New York: The Conference Board, Report #897, 1987.
9. Linda Haas, "Father's Participation in Parental Leave." Swedish Information Service, 1987.
10. National Research Council, *Women's Work, Men's Work: Sex Segregation on the Job*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1985.
11. Much of the discussion that follows is based on Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn, *The Responsive Workplace*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
12. Diana E. Friedman, *op. cit.*
13. A 1984 survey of large employers by Catalyst, a national nonprofit organization concerned with career and family options for corporate employees, found that 80 percent provided temporary disability coverage. A recent study by the National Council of Jewish Women, "Mothers in the Workplace," confirmed that paid medical leave was more likely to be offered by larger employers.
14. The 1985 weekly maximum benefits range from $145 per week in New York to $224 in California; for most female workers that replaced about half their wages. The duration of SDI benefits for pregnancy disability averages between six and ten weeks.

15. This amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted to circumvent the Supreme Court's 1976 decision in *Gilbert* v. *General Electric*, which held that discrimination on the basis of pregnancy was not sex discrimination within the meaning of Title VII. In an earlier case, *Gedulig* v. *Aiello*, the Supreme Court issued a similar ruling interpreting the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

16. This issue was raised in a 1987 Supreme Court case, *California Federal Savings and Loan* v. *Guerra*, involving a state law that required employers to provide women disabled by pregnancy with an unpaid disability leave of up to four months and with a right to return to a comparable job following the period of disability. A California employer challenged the state law as being in conflict with the PDA since it singled out pregnancy disability for special treatment. Rejecting this claim, the Supreme Court found no conflict with the PDA, since the purpose of the California law, like the PDA, was to advance equal opportunity for women. There are eight states with similar laws that allow a leave for pregnancy disability but not for all temporary medical disabilities.

17. Martin O'Connell and Carolyn C. Rogers, "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers: June 1982." *Current Population Reports*, Series P-23, No. 129. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

18. Kathryn Sean Perry, *Employers and Child Care: Establishing Services Through the Workplace*. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, 1982. Renee Y. Magid, *Child Care Initiatives for Working Parents: Why Employers Get Involved*. New York: American Management Association, 1983. Sandra Burud, Pamela R. Aschbacher, and Jacquelyn McCroskey, *Employer-Supported Child Care: Investing in Human Resources*. Boston: Auburn House, 1984.

FORD FOUNDATION GRANTS— WORK AND FAMILY ISSUES 1987–88

Grantee	Description (Duration, starting date)	Amount
Bank Street College of Education 610 West 112th Street New York, N.Y. 10025 Contact: Ellen Galinsky	Develop and disseminate a series of state-of-the-art reports for employers and employees on family-responsive workplace programs and survey public sector work and family programs in 50 states (18 mos.-Oct. 1, 1987)	$390,000
Bank Street College of Education 610 West 112th Street New York, N.Y. 10025 Contact: Ellen Galinsky	Survey and evaluation of four states' parental leave laws (2 yrs.-Sept. 1, 1988)	$390,000
Center for Law and Social Policy 1616 P Street, N.W., Suite 350 Washington, D.C. 20036 Contact: Alan Houseman	Project on family law and policy for low-income families (2 yrs.-June 1, 1987)	$100,000

Grantee	Description (Duration, starting date)	Amount
Center for Women Policy Studies 2000 P Street, N.W., Suite 508 Washington, D.C. 20036 Contact: Leslie Wolfe	Conference on work and family aimed at women in their twenties (1 yr.-Oct. 1, 1988)	$ 50,000
Child Care Action Campaign 99 Hudson Street New York, N.Y. 10013 Contact: Barbara Reisman	Research on the economics of child care and a related conference (1 yr.-Dec. 1, 1987)	$ 50,000
Child Care Law Center 625 Market Street San Francisco, Calif. 94105 Contact: Abby Cohen	Development of a legal guide for resource and referral agencies (1 yr.-Nov. 1, 1987)	$ 48,500
Citizens Fund 225 West Ohio Street, Suite 250 Chicago, Ill. 60610 Contact: Heather Booth	Technical assistance to state-based efforts to give a broad array of citizens a voice on work and family issues (16 mos.-Sept. 1, 1988)	$ 45,000
Cornell University Photosynthesis 418 N. Tioga Street Ithaca, N.Y. 14853 Contact: David Gluck	Production and distribution of a film on child care (1 yr.-Feb. 1, 1988)	$ 25,000

Grantee	Description (Duration, starting date)	Amount
Economic Policy Institute 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Suite 812 Washington, D.C. 20036 Contact: Heidi Hartmann	Policy research on the costs and benefits of disability leaves, including childbirth and parental leaves (6 mos.-June 1, 1987)	$ 45,500
Institute for American Values 250 West 57th Street, Suite 2415 New York, N.Y. 10107 Contact: David Blankenhorn	Planning and development of a national family agenda project (1 yr.-Aug. 1, 1987)	$ 50,000
Institute of Family and Environmental Research 7a Kidderpore Avenue London NW3 7SX, England Contact: Rhona Rapoport	Research on employer experience with parental leave in Sweden and career breaks in the United Kingdom (1 yr.-Dec. 1, 1988)	$ 50,000
Institute for Women's Policy Research 1400 20th Street, N.W., Suite 104 Washington, D.C. 20036 Contact: Heidi Hartmann	Studies relating to costs and benefits of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and to the costs of lack of medical leave (1 yr.-Nov. 1, 1988)	$ 50,000
KCTS Association 401 Mercer Street Seattle, Wash. 98195 Contact: Jeff Gentes	Community outreach activities related to a Public Broadcasting Service film on child care (6 mos.-Feb. 1, 1988)	$ 50,000

Grantee	Description (Duration, starting date)	Amount
National Academy of Sciences 2101 Constitution Avenue Washington, D.C. 20418 Contact: Brigid O'Farrell	Panel on employer policies and working families (20 mos.-Aug. 1, 1988)	$120,000
National Council of Jewish Women 15 East 26th Street New York, N.Y. 10010 Contact: James T. Bond	Study of mothers in the workplace (1 yr.-Dec. 1, 1987)	$ 50,000
National Women's Law Center 1616 P Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20046 Contact: Marcia Greenberger or Nancy Duff Campbell	Monitor legal and policy issues affecting low-income women and their families, including public benefit and family support programs such as child care (2 yrs.-May 1, 1988)	*
New Ways to Work 149 Ninth Street San Francisco, Calif. 94103 Contact: Paul Rupert	Equiflex Project to develop models for achieving flexibility in the workplace (1 yr.-Aug. 1, 1988)	$ 50,000

* Part of a general support grant to the organization.

Grantee	Description (Duration, starting date)	Amount
Rodgers & Associates Nine Galen Street, Suite 230 Watertown, Mass. 02172 Contact: Fran Rodgers	Research and consultation project on gender roles and workplace cultures (1 yr.-Dec. 1, 1988)	$ 50,000
Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies 316 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20003 Contact: Karen Baehler	Public engagement project on work and family issues (2 yrs.-Jan. 1, 1989)	$100,000
University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisc. 53706 Contact: Janet Hyde	Conference on "Parental Leave and Child Care: Setting a Research and Policy Agenda," and a book (1 yr.-Aug. 1, 1988)	$ 20,000
Women's Legal Defense Fund 2000 P Street, N.W., Suite 400 Washington, D.C. 20036 Contact: Judith Lichtman	Monitor legal and policy issues affecting working women and their families, including pregnancy discrimination and family and medical leave (2 yrs.-May 1, 1988)	*

* Part of a general support grant to the organization.